

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BANGALORE

DATED THIS THE 18TH DAY OF JUNE 1998

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE G.C.BHARUKA

CRIT PETITION NO:22668/1996

BETWEEN:

Miss Indira, aged 31 years,  
D/o Beeranna Nayak,  
r/o Hiregutti village & Post,  
Kumta Taluk, Uttara Kannada Dist.  
working as Hindi Teacher,  
in Mahatma Gandhi Vidhyavardhak,  
High School, Hiregutti,  
Kumta Taluk, U.K.Dist.  
(Education Dept.,)

(By Sri R.S.Hegde, Adv)

..Petitioner.

AND:

1. The State of Karnataka by  
its Commissioner and Secretary,  
Dept of Education,  
M.S.Building, Dr.Ambedkar Veedhi,  
Bangalore-560 001.
2. The Joint Director of  
Department of Public Institutions,  
Belgaum Division, Belgaum.  
Belgaum District,
3. The Deputy Director of  
Department of Public Instructions  
Karwar, U.K.District.

4. Mahatma Gandhi Vidhva Vardhak  
Sangha, Hiregutti,  
Kumta Taluk, U.K. rep by its  
Secretary.

5. The Head Master,  
Mahatma Gandhi Vidvardhak  
High School, Hiregutti,  
Kumta Taluk, U.K.District.

(By Sri G.Papi Reddy, AGA for R-1 to 3;  
Sri S.R.Hegde Hudlamane, Adv  
for R-4 & 5;)

..Respondents

. . .

Writ petition is filed under articles 226 & 227  
of the constitution of India with a prayer to  
quash the order vide Annex.C by R2 dated 24.7.96  
and to direct the R1 to 3 to accord approval,  
approving the appointment of the petitioner to  
the post of Hindi Teacher in R5 High School  
appointed by the R4 Sangha and to grant all  
benefits entitled to the petitioner in accordance  
with law.

This petition coming on for final disposal  
this day the Court made the following:

..ORDER..

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and Mrs.  
V. Vidya, learned H.C.G.P. for the respondents

2. The petitioner is an employee of a Private Educational institution. The relief claimed by him in the present writ petition pertains to his employment. The Division Bench of this Court in W.A. No. 1833 to 1836/95 and connected matters (DD 30.05.1998) has held that even if the private educational institution has been admitted to grant-in-aid under the provisions of the Grant-in-Aid Code by the State government, still no relationship of master and servant between the government and the person like the petitioner comes into being and therefore, the writ petition filed by such an employee is not maintainable under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, since he has effective, efficacious and alternative statutory remedies available under the Karnataka Education Act, 1983 (in short 'the Act').

3. In paragraph 12 of the judgment it has been held that.-

"As regards the locus standi of staff working in the aforesaid educational institutions to maintain the writ petitions, they have got the remedy of appeal under Section 94 of the Education Act against an order of dismissal or removal from service or reduction in rank. Under Section 130, appeal is provided against any order passed by an officer or authority under the Act. Section 131 provides for revision by Government either suo moto or on an application from any person interested. Section 132 of the Education Act provides for review by the State Government either suo moto or on an application received from any person

LM

360

interested. The Government is also vested with the power to give direction under Section 133 of the Said Act to make enquiry or take appropriate proceeding by the Commissioner or Director or any other officer not below the rank of District Educational Officer and to submit report. Thus, the Education Act provides for appeal, revision and review in respect of any order and in the absence of any order, the Government can be moved for issuing necessary direction in exercise of its power under Section 133 and the staff can avail the said remedies. Even with regard to payment of salary, what is stated above with regard to the teaching and non-teaching staff applies the other staff also. Without exhausting such alternative remedy, they cannot be permitted to invoke the extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution."

4. For the aforesaid reasons the writ petition is dismissed on the ground of availability of efficacious and effective alternative remedy. However, all the rights and contentions of the parties on merits are kept open for being agitated before the appropriate statutory authorities. If so advised, the petitioner may avail his statutory remedy by way of filing appeal / revision / application as the case may be under the Act within SIX WEEKS from today and in the event of filing of the same, the concerned authorities will dispose of such appeal / revision / application within THREE months from the date filing thereof. If any such remedy has already been availed, then the same should be disposed of within THREE months from the date of communication of this order.



Sd/-  
JUDGE

jsk/-